This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
JAN 24 1946
GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

HOUSE **No. 2000**

REPORT

OF

THE HOMESTEAD COMMISSION

MADE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 714 OF THE
ACTS OF 1912.

precedes the
ann. Rep'ts 1-7
1913-1919.

JANUARY, 1913.

BOSTON:
WRIGHT & POTTER PRINTING CO., STATE PRINTERS,
18 POST OFFICE SQUARE.
1913.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

BOSTON, January 1, 1913.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives.

In compliance with the provisions of Chapter 714 of the Acts of 1912, the Homestead Commission, created by Chapter 607 of the Acts of 1911, has the honor to submit the accompanying report and bills.

CHARLES F. GETTEMY, *Chairman.*
HENRY STERLING, *Secretary.*
WARREN DUNHAM FOSTER,
AUGUSTUS L. THORNDIKE,
CLEMENT F. COOGAN,
KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD,
EVA W. WHITE,
The Homestead Commission.

REPORT.

INTRODUCTORY.

By the terms of Chapter 607 of the Acts of 1911 the Homestead Commission was instructed to "report . . . a bill or bills embodying a plan and the method of carrying it out, whereby, with the assistance of the Commonwealth, homesteads or small houses and plots of ground may be acquired by mechanics, laborers, and others in the suburbs of cities and towns."

In pursuance of these instructions the Commission reported a bill (H. 442, 1912), accompanied by a brief report (H. 441, 1912), in January, 1912. At about the same date the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics issued (Labor Bulletin, No. 88) a review of work done in other countries similar to that contemplated by the act creating the Commission.

The bill provided that part of the unclaimed deposits in savings banks which had been called into the State treasury by Chapter 590, Section 56, of the Acts of 1908, should be loaned to the Commission to undertake the work proposed in Chapter 607, Acts of 1911. The constitutionality of this proposition was questioned during the passage of the measure through the Legislature, and the bill was on May 6, 1912, submitted to the Supreme Court for an opinion. On May 28, 1912, the court made answer (H. 2339, 1912) that such use of those funds or of any public funds would be a private and not a public use, and, therefore, it would be contrary to the provisions of the constitution.

Thereupon the General Court passed the following act (Chapter 714, Acts of 1912):

> SECTION 1. The commission established by chapter six hundred and seven of the acts of the year nineteen hundred and eleven shall continue its investigation of the need of providing homesteads for the people of the commonwealth and its study of plans already in operation or contemplated elsewhere for housing wage-earners, and shall report to the legislature not later than the first Wednesday in January, nineteen hundred and thirteen, and may recommend

such legislation as in its judgment will tend to increase the supply of wholesome homes for the people. The commission may expend in prosecution of its work such sums, not exceeding in the aggregate two thousand dollars, as the governor and council may approve.

SECTION 2. This act shall take effect upon its passage. [*Approved June 4, 1912.*

This report deals only with "the need of providing homesteads for the people of the Commonwealth." In regard to the second part of its instructions, the Commission reports that in order to secure late and accurate data upon that point questions calculated to bring out the information desired were sent to United States Secretary of State, the Hon. Philander C. Knox, with the request that they be submitted for answers to diplomatic and consular officials in certain countries. On November 11, 1912, Secretary Knox notified the Commission that the questions had been forwarded as asked. From these replies, when received, with other information at hand, the Commission hopes later to submit a comprehensive, accurate, and detailed report on the activities of foreign governments in endeavoring to ensure a sufficient supply of healthful homes for their people.

It may be well to say in this connection that in no country has private enterprise been equal to the task of properly housing the inhabitants. The people have suffered on account of bad and insufficient housing facilities to the detriment of private health and public welfare. In nearly every country of standing among civilized nations the government has actively aided and encouraged the creation of a larger supply of good homes. Governments have found this work necessary for the protection and preservation of their subjects.

The Commission elected to study some of the effects of bad home conditions on child life. In Ward 24 (Dorchester) of the city of Boston there were living, in 1905, 2,732 children under five years of age, of whom 76 died, a mortality rate of 28 per thousand. In the State that year there were 267,325 children below the age of five years. Had the same rate of mortality prevailed, 7,485 children of that age would have died. Instead of that number, however, there were 14,055 deaths in the State among children under five years of age, or 6,570 more than would have occurred had the lower Dorchester rate of mortality been maintained. Unfavorable environment before and after birth seems, therefore, to have been responsible for the sacrifice of 6,570 young children in Massachusetts in that year. The housing conditions generally throughout the Commonwealth ought to have been as good as, if not better than, those in Dorchester.

In a paper read before the Royal Statistical Society in London, February 17, 1901, Arthur Newsholme, M.D., declares that "infants form a very delicate index of the character and the environment of the individual, and a high infantile mortality may rightly be regarded as indicating unfavorable sanitary or social conditions."

The more crowded a community the greater the destitution; competition is more keen, and the struggle for existence is more feverish and exhausting. The crime, vice, illiteracy, filth, disease, and degradation engendered in slums will not however be dwelt upon in this report; it will not tell the cost to the individual and the Commonwealth — in terms of dollars and cents and lowered efficiency in citizenship. It is enough to consider only the effects of unwholesome homes upon little children. In the North End of Boston, in 1905, out of every thousand children under five years of age 85 died, while in other more favored parts of the city the death rates for children under five years of age were 28, 32, or 34 per thousand. The specific causes of this appalling difference in infant mortality between different sections of a single city may be in doubt. Crowding of population is not the sole reason for an excessive number of deaths, but in densely populated sections the sanitary and social conditions are usually bad and the infant mortality correspondingly high. Were families in such districts scattered over a larger area and housed in wholesome homes the excessive child mortality rate would be expected to decline.

INVESTIGATIONS OF TENEMENT-HOUSE CONDITIONS.

The need of some policy for lessening the evils resulting from congestion of population was first officially recognized in this country in 1856, when New York City appointed a tenement-house commission. Since this beginning of serious interest in the housing of wage-earners investigations of conditions in numerous cities have been made; tenements have been counted, the number of persons per room, per dwelling, and per acre has been ascertained, and the unhealthful surroundings of the abodes of the poor have been photographed and described.

In 1891 the Massachusetts General Court resolved,

> That the bureau of statistics of labor be hereby directed to ascertain and report to the next general court the number of families in the city of Boston residing in rented tenements; the average amount of rent paid monthly by each family; the number of rooms rented by each family; the average number of persons to each room, their sex and occupation; the length of time the heads of such families have been residents of the United States; what per cent. of the male population are citizens, and their nationality; and the sanitary condition of the tenements rented as aforesaid.

In pursuance of this resolve an exhaustive investigation was made, the results of which were published in the Annual Reports of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor for 1891 and 1892, commonly known as the "Tenement House Census."

A summary on page 359 of the report for 1891 shows that 147,476 persons, or 47.36 per cent of the tenement-house population, were living in 128,715 rooms, or an average of 1.15 persons to a room.

In Ward 5 — then as now a part of Charlestown — 3,539 persons, or 42.4 per cent of the tenement-house population, inhabited 3,283 rooms, or 1.08 persons to a room.

In the North End (Ward 6), 16,067 persons, 96.2 per cent of those living in tenements, were crowded into 10,646 rooms, or 1.60 persons to a room.

In old Ward 7 there were 9,173 persons, 91.8 per cent of the tenant population, living in 6,161 rooms, or 1.49 persons to a room. Three hundred and sixteen persons lived in 117 rooms, or 2.70 persons to a room.

Ward 8 had 64.6 per cent of its tenant population, or 6,028 persons, living in 5,089 rooms, or 1.18 persons to a room.

Only 18,476 tenant families, comprising 82,716 persons, had bathrooms; 53,189 families, numbering 228,680 persons, had none. In one ward less than one per cent of the tenement population were supplied with bathrooms, while in another over 72 per cent were so supplied.

Families to the number of 17,834, comprising 73,144 persons, had no outside yard space. The number of families to a yard varied from one to 41; 583 families, 1,805 persons, lived in basement tenements; and 688 families, 1,651 persons, were found in attic tenements.

Eight thousand four hundred and twenty-six families, comprising 37,613 persons, were found in rented tenements having poor or bad outside sanitary conditions.

Five thousand nine hundred and ninety-two families, comprising 26,097 persons, were found in tenements having inside sanitary conditions classed as poor or bad with respect to light and air.

Six thousand and fourteen families, comprising 26,201 persons, were found in tenements having inside sanitary conditions classed as poor or bad with respect to ventilation.

Eight thousand two hundred and eighty-eight families, comprising 38,311 persons, were found in tenements having inside sanitary conditions classed as poor or bad with respect to cleanliness.

Of all the families residing in rented tenements, 11.8 per cent were found in tenements classed as poor or bad with respect to outside sanitary conditions; 8.4 per cent in tenements whose inside sanitary condition was classed as poor or bad with respect to light and air; 8.4 per cent in tenements whose inside sanitary condition was classed as poor or bad with respect to ventilation; and 11.6 per cent in tenements whose inside sanitary condition was classed as poor or bad with respect to cleanliness.

There were 10,126 deaths in Boston in 1890, the year before the tenement-house census was taken. The population was 448,477; the mortality rate per thousand was 22.6. Of those who died, 3,347, or 33 out of every hundred, were under five years of age.

The agitation which procured the tenement-house census of 1891 produced other gratifying results. More stringent building laws were passed; laws against sweat-shops were enacted; the powers of the Board of Health were enlarged; more rigid sanitary requirements were made, and more thorough inspection was provided for; several organizations built "model" tenements; a People's Building Association was incorporated and erected "model" one and two-family houses; co-operative banks, created to aid wage-earners in procuring homes, increased in number and in the volume of business. A full account of all these activities and their effects on health, mortality, and economic conditions would doubtless be profitable. This Commission regrets lack of time and means for that purpose.

That the activity improved conditions somewhat is shown by some mortality statistics to follow in this report; but it failed to accomplish all that was hoped for, or *nearly* to approach even an approximate solution of the housing problem.

In 1895 a special committee of the Common Council investigated conditions in the North End and reported that the tenement houses there were a "serious menace to public health."

A voluntary canvass in 1898 of certain sections of the North and South districts of Boston, made by students of Wellesley College and Boston University, under the direction of Prof. F. Spencer Baldwin, and tabulated and published by the State Bureau of Statistics (Labor Bulletin, No. 11), found a slight increase in the density of population, but also a slight betterment in sanitary conditions.

In the same year the Twentieth Century Club published the results of an investigation made by H. K. Estabrook under the title "Some Slums in Boston." Descriptions of parts of the North, West, and South Ends and South Cove show conditions to be revolting.

In 1904 a Commission appointed in 1903 by Mayor P. A. Collins reported on tenement-house conditions in Boston. The Commission was united in condemnation of conditions as found, although divided as to recommendations. Their report (City Document 77, 1904) says (page 51):

> In 5,232 houses inspected there were 101,378 persons in 27,504 tenements, comprising 105,576 rooms, on 20,634 floors. Of 5,232 houses, 623, or 11.91 per cent., were overcrowded; 315, or 6.01 per cent., contained dark halls, and 1,052, or 20.11 per cent. had defective drainage. Water-closets numbered 20,490, *i.e.*, four per house, or 1.4 per tenement, or one to every 5 (4.9) occupants. Of the rooms inspected, 5,844, or 5.53 per cent, were pronounced "dark"; 3,446, or 3.26 per cent, were in basements. Of the basement rooms, 1,032, or 29.95 per cent, were occupied.
>
> Ward 6 contained the largest number of tenement houses, viz., 925 (with 26,259 occupants), found in any one ward. Ward 6, with Wards 8, 9, 10 and 18, contained over three-fifths of the tenement houses and nearly seven-tenths of the tenement house population of the city.
>
> In Ward 6 there were 28.3 occupants per tenement house, 4.8 per tenement, and 1.8 per room, against 19.3 occupants per house, 3.7 per tenement, and 0.96 per room for the city as a whole.

> Out of 5,844 dark rooms in the city, 4,486 were in the wards named above. The same wards contained 529 of the 623 over-crowded tenements of the city.

On page 3 of the Commission's report, it is said:

> With reference to the construction of new tenement houses, your Commission finds that the present laws with regard to fireproof construction make the building, within the fire limits, of tenement houses in which low rents can be asked quite impracticable. Such construction has largely ceased. The building of good low-priced tenement houses needs to be encouraged.

Nevertheless, the majority of the Commission recommended the passage of an entirely new act regulating further the construction, conditions, and supervision of buildings used as tenements. In this connection Samuel M. Child, in a minority report, stated that

> Building has practically ceased in Boston under the present law, owing to its stringent conditions and the price of material and labor. If the law be changed so as to permit substantial brick buildings of second-class construction, the so-called slum will disappear by its own weight. As quick as people can secure comfortable dwellings of modern construction for a price within their means they will immediately leave the old and tumble-down tenements, and the owner will be obliged, as a matter of self-defence, to rebuild.

In 1906 a new law was enacted relating to building requirements in Boston (Chapter 340, 1906) making special provisions (Section 2) for the conversion of old buildings into dwellings, tenements, or lodging-houses.

In the following year took place a comprehensive revision of the Boston building laws (Chapter 550, 1907), which contained 21 sections prescribing minutely the requirements concerning tenement-houses.

It would be interesting to verify or disprove the statements of the Collins Tenement House Commission, in 1904, given above, that tenement-house building had "practically ceased" owing to rigid requirements in construction, and also to know what had been the effect of the laws of 1906 and 1907 upon such construction; whether there are now more or less of such houses, to accommodate the increased population, and whether living conditions are better or worse than before those acts were passed. The Boston Building

Department states that it is unable to furnish information upon these points.

It is noticeable that the legislation above referred to and the agitation that produced it were directed against the insanitary tenements. But little effort was made to produce a sufficient supply of better habitations. What has been the result? Congestion in the most congested parts of the city has increased. Tables I and II show the population of Boston in 1905 and 1910 by wards, the number of acres of occupied and unoccupied land, and the density of population per acre in each ward:

TABLE I. — *Density of Population on Occupied Land in Boston, 1905.*

WARDS.	Population	Occupied Land (Acres)	Unoccupied Land (Acres)[1]	Persons per Acre, Occupied Land
The City.	**595,380**	**6,683.7**	**8,271.1**	**89.1**
1,	25,405	246.7	258.9	103.0
2,	25,929	226.3	13.1	114.6
3,	14,831	143.8	1.0	103.1
4,	12,499	183.5	12.0	68.1
5,	12,653	94.3	4.7	134.2
6,	29,987	143.7	1.3	208.7
7,	15,579	217.2	2.0	71.7
8,	30,810	82.1	7.2	375.2
9,	22,120	103.9	4.2	212.9
10,	23,841	182.0	45.0	131.0
11,	22,353	138.9	176.2	160.9
12,	21,738	105.2	3.7	206.6
13,	21,654	290.4	40.0	74.6
14,	22,127	213.9	32.3	103.4
15,	20,310	124.8	29.1	162.7
16,	21,924	218.8	111.6	100.2
17,	24,313	248.7	75.8	97.8
18,	22,121	120.6	13.0	183.4
19,	29,213	226.1	242.7	129.2
20,	41,805	715.7	418.0	58.4
21,	26,533	355.0	132.5	74.7
22,	27,769	351.0	206.0	79.1
23,	26,410	701.4	3,653.4	37.7
24,	31,650	720.6	1,516.4	43.9
25,	21,806	529.3	1,270.8	41.2

[1] This excludes 2,039.3 acres of marsh and flat lands.

TABLE II. — *Density of Population on Occupied Land in Boston, 1910.*

WARDS.	Population	Occupied Land (Acres)	Unoccupied Land (Acres)[1]	Persons per Acre, Occupied Land
The City.	**670,585**	**7,625.0**	**7,368.2**	**87.9**
1,	29,676	290.2	233.4	102.3
2,	28,812	234.9	9.3	122.7
3,	15,339	149.8	1.0	102.4
4,	13,294	191.7	9.8	69.3
5,	12,811	90.9	2.9	140.9
6,	35,758	154.9	0.5	230.8
7,	14,913	215.7	2.3	69.1
8,	32,430	82.1	7.5	395.0
9,	26,427	102.8	5.2	257.1
10,	25,320	186.1	39.3	136.1
11,	27,444	197.1	128.7	139.2
12,	24,294	105.0	3.0	231.4
13,	21,561	316.0	15.0	68.2
14,	23,584	309.5	29.7	76.2
15,	21,216	126.2	26.8	168.1
16,	25,633	242.4	90.3	105.7
17,	26,426	264.5	66.1	99.9
18,	22,735	114.5	18.2	198.6
19,	31,714	223.2	206.2	142.1
20,	55,720	800.7	318.7	69.6
21,	30,511	377.9	104.0	80.7
22,	29,975	361.6	194.7	82.9
23,	30,668	835.5	3,593.2	36.7
24,	37,749	915.4	1,205.4	41.2
25,	26,575	736.3	1,056.8	36.1

[1] This excludes 2,021.2 acres of marsh and flat lands.

In 1905, in Wards 6 and 8, lived 60,797 persons, more than one-tenth of the total population of the city, on less than one-fiftieth of its area. In 1910 the population of these two wards had increased to 68,188, which means that 7,391 more persons had crowded into the space already over-populated, — an increase of 12 per cent.

The Housing Committee of the movement known as "Boston-1915" made a careful examination of parts of Boston. On page 6 of its report it says:

The tenement districts of the North and West Ends, with a population in 1905 of 44,001 on 103.1 acres, had a density of population of 427 persons per acre. These Boston districts are said to be, and probably are, more densely populated than any other American city or district — except in New York. The Chicago "tenement-house population is oppressively dense," those working to improve conditions have said; but the three districts there, with a little greater population than the North and West End's tenement districts, have 206.2 persons per acre; and the most crowded district, 265.8.

In New York for the Lower East Side, whose congestion is infamously the worst in the world, the maximum density in 1905 is given as 575.5 persons per acre.

Of New York Assembly Districts only eight had over 407 persons per acre and only one, not on the Lower East Side, over 370. Even if these New York densities are accurate, the average density in our North and West End tenement district is considerably greater than that of any district but one beyond the Lower East Side, and it is 74 per cent as great as on the Lower East Side.

Within the North and West End tenement districts, and more than in similar New York districts, numerous blocks are devoted largely or chiefly to business or schools and other public buildings, and not to housing. The area of the house lots is only about one-half the total area of our tenement districts. On block No. 159, a typical block of this sort, and not one of the most crowded, bounded by Poplar, Brighton, Milton, and Spring streets, live 578 per acre.

On certain North and West End blocks and small groups of blocks, the density is decidedly greater than for the whole tenement districts. Six blocks, Nos. 15, 16, 31, 32, 33, and 34, around Thacher and Prince streets, had 3,311 inhabitants in 1905, 752.5 per acre. Five blocks around Brighton and Chambers streets, Nos. 161A, 161B, 172, 175, and 177½, had 2,490 inhabitants — 732.4 per acre; and blocks Nos. 175 and 177½, 830 per acre. New York's greatest assembly district density was 735.7 per acre.

Seven single North and West End blocks had in 1905 from 1,017 to 1,174 inhabitants — each a fair-sized town. As numerous blocks here, however, cover less than an acre, those with smaller population are often very crowded. Of twenty-two blocks, four had less than 500 per acre, — four between 500 and 600, nine between 600 and 720, four between 786 and 880, and one had 1,138 per acre.

Block No. 33, bounded by Prince, Thacher, North Margin streets, and Lafayette avenue, was, so far as known, the most densely populated block in Boston; it had 956 residents on .84 acre. They lived in houses averaging 3⅔ stories high — viz., 310 persons per acre per story. New York's most crowded block had 1,672 per acre in houses averaging 5½ stories, or 304 per acre per story.

The 956 persons on this North End block lived in 403 rooms — according to a careful count — an average of 2.37 persons per room, including all but halls, bathrooms and closets, and supposing all rooms on the block occupied. New York, for a considerable number of rooms, has found at the most 1.78 persons per room. Thus the *crowding* on this block was 33 per cent *greater than in New York.* The conditions on this block may be extreme. In our North and West Ends and South Cove in 1908 the Immigration Commission found an average of 144 persons per hundred rooms occupied, as compared with 139 in New York's immigrant districts, and from 115 to 141 in five other large cities.

In a study of four typical blocks in the North and West Ends, after detailing prevailing insanitary conditions, the report tells of overcrowding in rooms in the unwholesome houses:

Extreme overcrowding is shown when the average persons per room for each apartment is stated. On the fourth block, 26 per cent of the persons live in apartments with two or more persons per room, counting all rooms but bathrooms, closets, and halls; on the third block, 38 per cent of the persons live in apartments with two to 2.9 persons per room, and on each North End block nearly 53 per cent. On the third block, one family of seven live in two rooms, and one of six in a single room behind a store. On the North End blocks, twelve families of 101 persons live in apartments with three to 3.9 persons per room; one family of eight and another of ten live in two rooms each.

In the bedrooms conditions are still worse. The Immigration Commission in its recent investigation found an average of 232 persons per hundred sleeping-rooms in the immigrant districts of the seven large cities studied. Including kitchens, and even a bathroom, used as bedrooms — as perhaps the Commission did not do — we found on the fourth block 209 persons per hundred bedrooms; on the third block, 236; on the first block, 241; and on the second block, 261, or 29 more than the average in the seven cities; on the five blocks together, we found 2,126 persons in 891 bedrooms, an average of 239 per hundred bedrooms. Thus, the North and West End tenement districts are considerably more congested than the immigrant districts of the other large cities. Of the total population, 47 per cent on the fourth block, 59 per cent on the third block, 64 per cent on the first block, and 69 per cent on the second block, sleep in bedrooms occupied by three or more persons; 23 per cent on the fourth block, 26 per cent on both the third and first blocks, and 39 per cent on the second block, sleep in bedrooms occupied by four or more persons. On the blocks in the order last named, 10, 30, 35, and 50 persons sleep in bedrooms occupied by five persons each, and 0, 12, 12, and 24 persons in bedrooms occupied by six persons each, and on each block seven persons sleep in a single room. On the fourth block four per cent, on the first and third blocks 10 per cent, and on the second block 12 per cent of the total population sleep in bedrooms occupied by five to seven persons each.

Kitchens are frequently used as bedrooms; on the fourth block, ten, by seventeen persons; on the third block, sixteen, by 27 persons; on the second block, 25, by 37 persons; and on the first block, 37, by 89 persons. On the first block three persons sleep in each of 15 kitchens and four persons in each of five kitchens.

Bedrooms are occupied day and night by two sets of sleepers on each block; one by three persons on the fourth block; two by six persons on the second block; four by 10 persons on the third block; and 12 by 33 persons on the first block — here, as usual, the worst. In one three-room apartment on the top floor of 24 Stillman street one room is occupied by three men, the one bed in the other bedroom by a young man during the day, and by two young women at night, and in the kitchen a woman sleeps during the day and the mother and two children at night.

Much can wisely be said against even three persons sleeping in a large room. But we found on each block from four to seven persons sleeping in small rooms, often in smaller rooms than the tenement house law permits. The law for Boston provides only that "the Board of Health may by vote limit the number of occupants," permitted in any building or part thereof. When the building law required every room to contain at least 765 cubic feet of air space, it was not intended that four persons should sleep in rooms of the minimum size, yet nearly nine per cent of the persons on these four blocks have each less than one-quarter the air-space of the minimum-sized room. Twenty-six per cent of these persons sleep so close that in rooms 8½ feet high they cover one-third of the floor area, and nine per cent more cover one-half the floor area.

On the fourth block, including one-half the bounding streets, 520 persons live on 0.91 of an acre, a density of 571 persons per acre. On the second block 752 persons live on 0.85 of an acre, 885 per acre. On the first and third blocks so much of the area, and particularly corners, is devoted to business that the density per acre gives no idea of the crowding. Including only lots used wholly or in part for residences, we found 816 persons per acre on the fourth block, 872 on the third, 1,032 on the first, and 1,179 on the second block.

The report states that these four blocks are typical of all in the congested districts. "As live nearly 2,400 persons on these four blocks, so live the 44,000 or more inhabitants of the North and West End tenement districts."

Considering the ills arising from congestion, and the unwholesome conditions that follow in its train, the report reaches the conclusion that, "Its full evil effects are not susceptible of demonstration in figures, *though they show plainly enough in the death rate of infants*."

Such are the conditions that still exist in Boston after forty years of agitation and legislation. These are not extreme cases, but are typical — neither better nor worse — of the conditions under which 40,000 or 50,000 people live in the poorer tenement districts.

THE EVIDENCE OF STATISTICS.

In presenting the following tables we wish again to state that it is not our belief that congestion of population is solely responsible for excessive infant mortality. There are many factors in the problem, but overcrowding of buildings on land and of people in tenements is the most fundamental, far-reaching, and deadly. Many of the other factors grow out of congestion or accompany it, and would disappear with it.

Again it is to be remembered that "infants form a very delicate index of the character and environment." The fate of children born into any given environment should show whether the home conditions are wholesome or deadly; whether or not there is urgent need of more homes and better homes. The effect of such environment upon those who survive is a matter for serious concern. Are such surroundings conducive to good citizenship? Can the State prosper which rears thousands of its children in such conditions? Is the public conscience so calloused and the governmental powers so circumscribed by judicial constitutional interpretation that nothing can be done to remove this sore from the social body?

A study of the records of child mortality is of deep interest in connection with the subject of congestion. The general mortality rate for Boston varies of late years between 20.8 per thousand inhabitants in 1900 and 17.2 in 1910. Of these decedents 27.0 out of each hundred were children under five years of age. Table III shows the total deaths, by wards, in the city of Boston in 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1908, the general mortality rate, the number of deaths of children under five years of age, and the percentage of those under five years to the whole number of deaths in the ward.

TABLE III. — *General and Child Mortality: By Wards of Boston.*[1]

WARDS.	1905				1906				1907				1908			
	Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	Deaths of Children under Five Years of Age		Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	Deaths of Children under Five Years of Age		Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	Deaths of Children under Five Years of Age		Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	Deaths of Children under Five Years of Age	
			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths
The City.	**9,717**	**16**	**2,682**	**27.6**	**10,003**	**17**	**3,027**	**30.3**	**10,093**	**16**	**2,719**	**26.9**	**10,077**	**16**	**3,318**	**32.9**
1,	385	15	113	29.4	440	17	155	35.2	379	14	110	29.0	424	15	160	37.7
2,	390	15	123	31.5	430	16	157	36.5	395	15	155	39.2	430	16	185	43.0
3,	291	19	70	24.1	315	21	96	30.5	289	19	72	24.9	280	16	91	32.5
4,	255	20	81	31.8	243	19	65	26.7	253	20	72	28.5	225	18	70	31.1
5,	245	19	69	28.2	252	20	66	26.2	254	19	71	28.0	254	17	78	30.7
6,	642	21	328	51.1	621	20	318	51.2	715	23	390	54.5	655	19	369	56.3
7,	315	20	73	23.2	338	21	91	26.9	331	20	67	20.2	354	21	126	35.6
8,	434	14	149	34.3	426	14	152	35.7	442	14	152	34.4	409	13	156	38.1
9,	481	22	111	23.1	456	20	124	27.2	473	21	100	21.1	455	20	142	31.2
10,	283	12	41	14.5	320	13	62	19.4	315	13	50	15.9	307	12	60	19.5
11,	287	13	43	15.0	313	14	57	18.2	283	12	38	13.4	280	12	49	17.5
12,	396	18	67	16.9	356	16	82	23.0	373	17	54	14.5	354	16	74	20.9
13,	516	24	182	35.3	516	23	210	40.7	515	23	169	32.8	486	21	212	43.6
14,	401	18	93	23.2	403	18	122	29.9	384	17	103	26.8	389	17	137	35.2
15,	340	17	100	29.4	356	17	97	27.2	357	17	82	23.0	357	17	124	34.7
16,	337	15	80	23.7	344	15	92	26.7	325	14	65	20.0	334	14	102	30.5
17,	469	19	140	29.9	480	19	149	31.0	473	19	137	29.0	499	19	170	34.1
18,	388	18	124	32.0	408	18	125	30.6	451	20	145	32.2	444	19	176	39.6
19,	483	17	155	32.1	501	17	160	31.9	499	16	133	26.7	477	15	146	30.6
20,[2]	546	13	116	21.2	577	14	146	25.3	600	14	129	21.5	579	13	129	22.3
21,	386	15	66	17.1	387	14	72	18.6	383	14	46	12.0	431	15	95	22.0
22,	381	14	85	22.3	376	13	104	27.7	389	14	90	23.1	460	16	138	30.0
23,	325	12	82	25.2	378	14	93	24.6	409	15	93	22.7	390	14	98	25.1
24,	404	13	76	18.8	430	13	129	30.0	440	13	98	22.3	446	13	130	29.1
25,	291	13	86	29.6	313	14	99	31.6	317	14	91	28.7	302	13	88	29.1
Ward unknown,	46	–	29	63.0	19	–	4	21.1	49	–	7	14.3	56	–	13	23.2

---

[1] Deaths recorded for wards of Boston are for residents of Boston and do not include the non-residents or those of unknown residence.

[2] Infant asylum in Ward 20.

Table III does not in itself give an entirely accurate conception of the relation of infant mortality to congestion, inasmuch as the proportion of children to adults is not shown. The number of children under five years of age in the different wards seems not to be obtainable, except for the year 1905. Table IV gives the population by wards for that year, the number of children under five years living in each ward, the number of deaths and the rate per thousand among such children, together with the general mortality rate. Table V shows for each ward of Boston the density of population, the child mortality rate, the proportion of children under five years to the total population of the ward, and the general death rate. There seems to be no one cause that will account for the wide difference between a child mortality rate of 28 in Ward 24 and 85 in Ward 6.

TABLE IV. — *Population, Number of Children under Five Years, Number of Deaths under Five Years, Child and General Mortality Rates: By Wards, Boston, 1905.*

WARDS.	Population	CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS			Rate per 1,000 Population
		Total Number	Number of Deaths	Rate per 1,000	
The City.	**595,380**	**52,152**	**2,682**[1]	**51**	**16**
1,	25,405	2,609	113	43	15
2,	25,929	2,698	123	46	15
3,	14,831	1,458	70	48	19
4,	12,499	1,185	81	68	20
5,	12,653	1,000	69	69	19
6,	29,987	3,844	328	85	21
7,	15,579	983	73	74	20
8,	30,810	3,080	149	48	14
9,	22,120	1,686	111	66	22
10,	23,841	804	41	51	12
11,	22,353	782	43	55	13
12,	21,738	918	67	73	18
13,	21,654	2,555	182	71	24
14,	22,127	2,275	93	41	18
15,	20,310	1,915	100	52	17
16,	21,924	2,080	80	38	15
17,	24,313	2,469	140	57	19
18,	22,121	2,011	124	62	18
19,	29,213	3,059	155	51	17
20,	41,805	3,600	116	32	13
21,	26,533	1,611	66	41	15
22,	27,769	2,520	85	34	14
23,	26,410	2,199	82	37	12
24,	31,650	2,732	76	28	13
25,	21,806	2,079	86	41	13

[1] Includes 29, ward unknown.

TABLE V. — *Density of Population, Occupied Land, Child and General Mortality, Rates, and Percentage of Children under Five to Total Population: By Wards, Boston, 1905.*

WARDS.	Number Persons per Acre of Occupied Land	Percentage, Children under Five Years, of Total Population	Death Rate per 1,000 Children under Five Years	Death Rate per 1,000 Population
The City.	89.1	8.8	51	16
1,	103.0	10.3	43	15
2,	114.6	10.4	46	15
3,	103.1	9.8	48	19
4,	68.1	9.5	68	20
5,	134.2	7.9	69	19
6,	208.7	12.8	85	21
7,	71.7	6.3	74	20
8,	375.2	10.0	48	14
9,	212.9	7.6	66	22
10,	131.0	3.4	51	12
11,	160.9	3.5	55	13
12,	206.6	4.2	73	18
13,	74.6	11.8	71	24
14,	103.4	10.3	41	18
15,	162.7	9.4	52	17
16,	100.2	9.5	38	15
17,	97.8	10.2	57	19
18,	183.4	9.1	62	18
19,	129.2	10.5	51	17
20,	58.4	8.6	32	13
21,	74.7	6.1	41	15
22,	79.1	9.1	34	14
23,	37.7	8.3	37	12
24,	43.9	8.6	28	13
25,	41.2	9.5	41	13

Ward 24, with 28 deaths out of each thousand children, has the best record of any ward in the city for 1905. If this record be taken as a criterion, then out of the 52,152 children under five years living in Boston that year there should have been only 1,460 deaths. There were, however, 2,653, — a sacrifice of the lives of 1,193 children in Boston in a year.

In Ward 6 in that year 22,779 persons, or 76 per cent of the total population of the ward, lived on 43 blocks, bounded by Endicott, Thacher, Washington street north, Causeway, Prince, Snowhill, Charter, Jackson avenue, Commercial, North, and Cross streets. These blocks and one-half their bounding streets have an area of 57.2 acres and the density of population was 398 persons per acre. There were 514 deaths in this congested area, with a total of 642 for the entire ward, a death rate of 21.0 per thousand population. Of the 514 deaths in the densely populated section, 275, or 53.5 of each hundred, were of children under five years of age. Since 76 per cent of the total population of the ward lived within this area, it is probably safe to assume that approximately 76 per cent of those under five years old lived there also; there were then 2,921 in those crowded tenements. Of these, 275 died — 94 out of each thousand.

Compare this 94 per thousand in the North End congested tenement district with 28 per thousand in Dorchester. Have we not need of better homes?

The West End makes a somewhat better showing. There 21,222 persons, or 69 per cent of the population of Ward 8, lived on 39 blocks bounded by Merrimac, Pitts, Green, Chambers, Allen, Charles, Leverett, Brighton, Lowell, Minot, Nashua, and Causeway streets, with one-half their bounding streets, an area of 45.9 acres and a density of 462 persons per acre. Of 434 deaths in the ward, 297 occurred in this district, making a mortality rate of 14 per thousand. Of the 297 deaths, 112, or 37.7 in each hundred, were of children under five years of age. If 69 per cent of the children lived in the crowded area, then out of 2,125 under five years old 112 died, a rate of 52.7 per thousand.

It will be of interest to transpose Table V so as to make a clearer showing of whatever relation may exist between congestion and child mortality in 1905. Table VI gives the same particulars as Table V, with the wards arranged in order of density.

TABLE VI. — *Table V rearranged by Wards in Order of Density.*

WARDS.	Number Persons per Acre of Occupied Land	Percentage, Children under Five Years, of Total Population	Death Rate per 1,000 Children under Five Years	Death Rate per 1,000 Population
The City.	89.1	8.8	51	16
8,	375.2	10.0	48	14
9,	212.9	7.6	66	22
6,	208.7	12.8	85	21
12,	206.6	4.2	73	18
18,	183.4	9.1	62	18
15,	162.7	9.4	52	17
11,	160.9	3.5	55	13
5,	134.2	7.9	69	19
10,	131.0	3.4	51	12
19,	129.2	10.5	51	17
2,	114.6	10.4	46	15
14,	103.4	10.3	41	18
3,	103.1	9.8	48	19
1,	103.0	10.3	43	15
16,	100.2	9.5	38	15
17,	97.8	10.2	57	19
22,	79.1	9.1	34	14
21,	74.7	6.1	41	15
13,	74.6	11.8	71	24
7,	71.7	6.3	74	20
4,	68.1	9.5	68	20
20,	58.4	8.6	32	13
24,	43.9	9.0	28	12
25,	41.2	10.0	41	13
23,	37.7	8.3	37	12

It is greatly to be regretted that a study, similar to the above, of child mortality rates in the different wards cannot be made for a series of years, but the particulars seem to be obtainable for 1905 only. The conclusions to be drawn, however, from Tables IV, V, and VI, where the rate of mortality among children under five can be given, do not differ greatly from those to be gained by a study of Table III where the percentage of such deaths to the total number of deaths is shown. Rather, they strengthen the inference that undue density of population causes, among other social ills, excessive mortality among children. This conclusion is drawn from the percentage of deaths as shown in Table III and confirmed by Tables IV, V, and VI, which show the proportion of children under five years to the total population in each ward and give the mortality rate per thousand of such children.

TOPOGRAPHICAL AND PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Room, light, air, and sunshine are essential for the preservation of infant life. Deprived of these in the congested localities, children die in appalling numbers. Their loss is registered in the child mortality rates shown in the tables of this report. The principal topographical and other physical characteristics of populated areas should, therefore, have consideration in studying child mortality. Some of these for the several wards of Boston are accordingly given here:

Ward 1 (East Boston). — The East Boston portion of the ward is generally of good elevation, consisting of two hills, one rising to 85 feet; another to about 50 feet. A depression almost to tide-water exists southeast of the tracks of the Boston & Albany Railroad. Breed's Island consists of practically one large hill, whose maximum height is above 160 feet. Almost one-half is but little above marsh level. Residential except the shore front, 86 acres of park land.

Ward 2 (East Boston). — East of Lewis street the ward is generally well elevated from about 65 feet at its center, sloping northeasterly and southwesterly to the water. The portion west of Lewis street is generally low, lying little above high water. The greater portion of this ward is low filled land. It contains many stores, warehouses, and wharves, and is a mixed business and residential section of the city; two acres of park area.

Ward 3 (Charlestown). — Well elevated. The hill at the base of Bunker Hill monument is 86 feet above low water. North of Medford street has been reclaimed from tide-water, and is but four feet above it. The district bounded by the Mystic and Charles rivers and Mt. Vernon, Chelsea, Vine, Bunker Hill, and Lexington streets is principally low land and densely populated. It contains the Navy Yard, which includes 87 acres of the ward territory; five acres of park land.

Ward 4 (Charlestown). — North of Main street is generally well elevated; on Bunker Hill street, near North Mead street, the elevation is 108 feet above mean low water. The territory south of Main street is low, being about grade 17.

Ward 5 (Charlestown). — All of the ward north of Rutherford avenue is of fair elevation; the portion south of this street falls to a height little above high water.

Ward 6 (North End). — The land is of good general elevation, with the exception of the water front and a small portion reclaimed from the Old Mill Pond, where the elevation is from 16 to 20 feet above mean low water. East of the location of the Old Mill Pond is Copp's Hill, whose maximum elevation is about 60 feet on the street grade.

The southwesterly extremity of the ward is marked by a considerable rise, which includes Pemberton square and the easterly brow of Beacon Hill, the extreme elevation of which is about 93 feet (at Bowdoin street). This ward is in the oldest part of the city, and has the largest foreign population of any of the wards; the second largest ward in total population, being exceeded only by Ward 20, which has about 2,000 more in population, but is nearly six times as great in area; although densely populated, it still has a very large portion of its area given over to business purposes; it contains three acres of cemetery area and one acre of playground. The infant mortality is the greatest of any of the wards.

Ward 7 (Business district). — The northerly half is well elevated. It includes the Common and reaches east, including what is known as the "Burnt District"; also the old Fort Hill District. The part of the ward lying between Beach street and Castle street, and from Pleasant street to the water, is generally low. It includes the old South Cove territory, which was reclaimed from tide-water, and is about six feet above it. The highest point in the ward is at the junction of Beacon and Park streets, being there about 86 feet above mean low water.

Ward 8 (West End). — The land is generally quite low. A small portion of the ward lies upon the northerly slope of Beacon Hill, from Beacon street directly north, including the State House. The elevation here is high, being between 90 and 100 feet at the summit, and sloping gradually. A large part of the ward was reclaimed from the Old Mill Pond. The land in the vicinity of the Massachusetts General Hospital is low.

Ward 9 (South End). — Most of the ward is made land. The average elevation is the lowest in the city, being about grade 16. Almost the entire territory is little above tide-water, a portion of it — "Suffolk Street District" — being filled from marsh level to its present grade, 18. The corner of Shawmut avenue and Dwight street is at grade 12, and is one of the lowest grades in the city for a main thoroughfare.

Ward 10 (South End and Back Bay). — The ward was originally a marshy tract of land. It has been well filled, and is a fine residential section with very little of it devoted to business purposes. The entire ward can be considered low, the territory being practically level at grade of 18.

Ward 11 (Back Bay). — This district includes the westerly slope of Beacon Hill, the grade ranging from 108 to 17 at Charles street. The entire Back Bay District is within its limits and may be called low, the grades along Beacon street being 17, while the remainder of the district is 18. The remainder of the ward, lying between Massachusetts avenue and St. Mary's street, ranges from a grade of 19 to about 30; its average, however, will be about 20.

Ward 12 (South End). — This ward is generally low land; it includes seven acres of park area and is a residential section. The maximum grade is about 18, the minimum about 16.

Ward 13 (South Boston). — Much of the area of this ward is made land and lies quite low, being but a few feet above high water; nearly, if not quite, one-half of the solid area of the ward has been reclaimed from tide-water. A great part of this ward is given over to business purposes.

Ward 14 (South Boston). — This ward has a rolling surface, some very high land, and is almost surrounded by water; the difference in death rates between this ward and the neighboring ward, 13, is very marked, and is no doubt largely due to the character of the land within its limits.

Ward 15 (South Boston). — A portion of the ward, in the vicinity of Telegraph Hill, is relatively very high, about 150 feet; the territory from the foot of the slope of the hill is generally quite low, being but a few feet above tide-water.

Ward 16 (Dorchester and South Boston). — The grade of one-half of the territory in the ward is high, the maximum being about 116, sloping easterly to Norfolk avenue where the depression around the South Bay and Dorchester Bay begins and where the grade falls off to 17, 18, and 20.

Ward 17 (Roxbury). — The southerly end of the ward, which includes Mt. Pleasant, is well elevated and well disposed for proper drainage; the maximum grade reaches nearly 110; the more easterly portion, lying north of Eustis street, Hampden street, and Dudley street, may be considered low, the grade varying from 20 at Hampden street to high-water level.

Ward 18 (Roxbury). — This ward is nearly all low land, much of it made by filling, the grade for the major part of the ward being about 18; an exceedingly small part, lying south of Roxbury street, as far as Bartlett street, is well elevated; it is practically a residential district.

Ward 19 (Roxbury). — Land high. Parker Hill, on whose summit at grade 219 the city has a reservoir, is here located. About one-third of the ward, that portion lying north of Longwood avenue, averages about 18 feet above mean low water. The percentage of deaths in the ward to the total mortality of the city is high, as is also the percentage of infant mortality. There are upwards of 200 acres of park area within the limits of the ward.

Ward 20 (Dorchester). — Land high, all the territory being high above tide-water. Several elevations here exist at heights of 130 to 160 feet above low water; between these hills are depressions. The lowest portion of the ward is at marsh level. This ward has the largest population of any in the city, its area is fourth in size, and it is a fine residential section.

Ward 21 (Roxbury). — The land is nearly all well elevated above tide-water, at points to elevations of 130, 140, 150, and 182 feet, with good drainage. A large proportion of the houses are single and detached; there are about 14 acres of park area and four acres of cemetery area within the ward limits.

Ward 22 (Roxbury). — The territory is high and healthy, and, excepting the depression along the line of Stony Brook, there are no low areas.

Ward 23 (West Roxbury). — The entire ward is comparatively high above mean low water, reaching at one point a height over 300 feet, the highest land within the city limits; well disposed for drainage purposes, with the exception of the territory along the course of Stony Brook. This is the largest ward, territorially, in the city. It contains 687 acres of park area.

Ward 24 (Dorchester). — Generally well elevated above tide-water, one of the hills rising to a height of 180 feet. The only low territory is at Neponset. There are above 100 acres of park area.

Ward 25 (Brighton). — Largely well elevated, some points rising to over 200 feet above mean low water.

Whatever else is necessary, better homes are essential to save the children. If the community did its duty by its children would not the rate of 28 deaths per thousand, as shown in Ward 24 in 1905, be equalled or surpassed in every ward in the city?

CONDITIONS IN THE SMALLER MUNICIPALITIES OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

Thus far this report has referred only to Boston. But conditions are as bad or worse in some of the smaller cities in the Commonwealth, as shown by Table VII, which gives for Massachusetts the total number of deaths, the mortality rates, the number of deaths of children under five years of age, and the percentage of deaths to the total number of deaths for 1900, 1905, and 1910.

TABLE VII. — *General and Child Mortality for Massachusetts — Comparison for 1900, 1905, and 1910.*

CITIES.	1900				1905				1910			
	Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	DEATHS OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OF AGE		Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	DEATHS OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OF AGE		Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	DEATHS OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OF AGE	
			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths
The State.	**51,156**	**18.2**	**16,310**	**31.9**	**50,486**	**16.8**	**14,055**	**27.8**	**54,407**	**16.2**	**15,433**	**28.4**
Beverly,	198	14.3	43	21.7	249	16.4	46	18.5	246	13.2	46	18.7
Boston,[1]	11,671	20.8	3,749	32.1	11,002	18.5	3,128	28.4	11,567	17.2	3,122	27.0
Brockton,	555	13.9	162	29.2	626	13.1	146	23.3	710	12.5	182	25.6
Cambridge,	1,520	16.5	509	33.5	1,436	14.7	412	28.7	1,576	15.0	401	25.4
Chelsea,	648	19.0	214	33.0	695	18.6	207	29.8	605	18.6	134	22.1
Chicopee,	396	20.7	213	53.8	357	17.7	166	46.5	389	15.3	193	49.6
Everett,	371	15.2	143	38.5	404	13.9	123	30.4	370	11.1	88	23.8
Fall River,	2,258	21.5	1,157	51.2	2,112	20.0	1,118	52.9	2,206	18.5	1,110	50.3
Fitchburg,	494	15.7	205	41.5	456	13.8	158	34.6	496	13.1	172	34.7
Gloucester,	444	17.0	108	24.3	398	15.3	122	30.7	391	16.0	66	16.9
Haverhill,	578	15.5	139	24.0	611	16.2	149	24.4	768	17.4	191	24.9
Holyoke,	1,004	22.0	475	47.3	833	16.7	359	43.1	1,027	17.7	470	45.8
Lawrence,	1,276	20.4	540	42.3	1,386	19.8	581	41.9	1,534	17.9	717	46.7
Lowell,	1,850	19.5	691	37.4	1,899	20.0	688	36.2	2,101	19.8	835	39.7
Lynn,	1,090	15.9	309	28.3	1,270	16.5	335	26.4	1,184	13.3	304	25.7
Malden,	489	14.5	164	33.5	507	13.3	132	26.0	582	13.1	129	22.2
Marlborough,	208	15.3	84	40.4	209	14.9	38	18.2	171	11.7	35	20.5
Medford,	247	13.5	75	30.4	265	13.5	55	20.8	243	10.5	33	13.6
Melrose,	188	14.5	51	27.1	192	13.5	31	16.1	205	13.0	45	22.0
New Bedford,	1,323	21.2	579	43.8	1,300	17.5	534	41.1	1,821	18.8	894	49.1
Newburyport,	302	20.9	60	19.9	284	19.4	54	19.0	278	18.6	45	16.2
Newton,	504	15.0	159	31.5	488	13.3	117	24.0	485	12.2	106	21.9
North Adams,	350	14.5	131	37.4	315	14.2	90	28.6	322	14.6	78	24.2
Northampton,	370	19.8	99	26.8	331	16.6	71	21.5	367	18.9	55	15.0

---

[1] Includes deaths of non-residents and those of unknown residence.

TABLE VII. — *General and Child Mortality for Massachusetts — Comparison for 1900, 1905, and 1910 — Concluded.*

CITIES.	1900				1905				1910			
	Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	DEATHS OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OF AGE		Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	DEATHS OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OF AGE		Total Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000	DEATHS OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OF AGE	
			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths			Number	Per cent of Total Deaths
Pittsfield,	357	16.4	105	29.4	415	16.6	78	18.8	571	17.8	149	26.1
Quincy,	347	14.5	123	35.4	368	13.1	112	30.4	386	11.8	116	30.1
Salem,	714	19.9	271	38.0	743	19.8	271	36.5	697	16.0	194	27.8
Somerville,	966	15.7	317	32.8	958	13.8	209	21.8	1,043	13.5	240	23.0
Springfield,	1,175	18.9	369	31.4	1,128	15.3	262	23.2	1,484	16.7	458	30.9
Taunton,	667	21.5	205	30.7	679	21.9	200	29.5	810	23.6	258	31.9
Waltham,	368	15.7	95	25.8	367	14.0	55	15.0	390	14.0	66	16.9
Woburn,	257	18.0	78	30.4	223	15.5	52	23.3	242	15.8	65	26.9
Worcester,	2,267	19.1	781	34.5	2,264	17.7	621	27.4	2,481	17.0	732	29.5
Towns over 5,000,[1]	7,680	16.0	2,189	28.5	8,169	15.0	2,094	25.6	9,387	14.8	2,390	25.5
Towns under 5,000,[1]	8,024	18.1	1,718	21.4	7,547	16.9	1,241	16.4	7,272	16.6	1,314	18.1

[1] In 1900 there were 60 towns of more than 5,000 population and 260 towns of less than 5,000 population.
In 1905 there were 64 towns of more than 5,000 population and 257 towns of less than 5,000 population.
In 1910 there were 71 towns of more than 5,000 population and 250 towns of less than 5,000 population.

Reference to Tables IV and V shows that children under five years of age constitute practically one-tenth of the total population. As shown in Table III, this one-tenth sometimes furnishes one-half the total deaths in certain cities. Such a striking disproportion should concern every good citizen. The continuation of the conditions that produce it is a shame to the Commonwealth. Living conditions in the home must be worse in some of those smaller cities than they are even in the worst slums of Boston, for the results on child life are worse, as shown in the tables. Moreover, these figures cover the whole territory of each city, although the worst Boston figures refer only to the worst parts of the city. For Boston as a whole, congested as some parts are, the proportion of deaths of children under five is only from 25 to 30 out of a hundred deaths; although in some of these smaller cities in each hundred deaths there are 40 or even 50 of young children.

The cities themselves seem to be unaware of the deplorable conditions in which many of their inhabitants live. It would be too great a reproach to say that they do know, but do nothing. It is hoped that the publication of these statistics and the work of this Commission will arouse an adequate sense of civic responsibility not only for these untimely, unnecessary deaths, but also for the sinister impress upon the character of the survivors.

Few actual descriptions of living conditions in these cities are to be had. A survey of some localities in Fall River has recently been published by the Housing Committee of the Associated Charities, and some facts regarding Lawrence were printed in a report on the strike of the textile workers in 1912, prepared under the direction of Charles P. Neill, United States Commissioner of Labor. The Fall River "Survey" describes and photographs conditions in tenement houses which might well be expected to produce a record of 51.2 (1900), 52.9 (1905), and 50.3 (1910) deaths of children under five years out of each hundred deaths. It would be some satisfaction if there were any certainty that the slight improvement in 1910 would be permanent.

Some facts concerning Lawrence are here abstracted from the report of the Commissioner of Labor referred to above (page 145):

> Practically all of the textile-mill employees live in wooden tenement houses. . . . The most usual types . . . are three and four story tenement buildings; and in the more thickly settled portions of the city

> not only the front but also the rear of the lots are occupied by buildings. These rear houses can usually be reached from an alley, but the principal entrance, and in some cases the only entrance, is through a passageway between the front buildings. These passageways vary in width, and in many places in the older sections of the city they are only from 3½ to 5 feet in width. . . .
>
> The congestion within the central district is most remarkable. For every 100 acres there are 2,036 apartments; in the rest of North Lawrence, 443 apartments; and in South Lawrence, 152 apartments. As a matter of fact two or three houses occupy so fully the lots on which they stand that there is not room to place a garbage can on the same lot with the house. . . .
>
> These houses are found not only in the older sections of the city, but also in the newer sections, where ground is worth not more than 20 to 25 cents per square foot. . . .
>
> The new houses that are being built at the rear are large houses. Seventy such built in the last four and one-half years contain 255 apartments. There are in the central 300 acres, 360; in a district bounded by the rivers, Park, May, and Margin streets, 500; in North Lawrence, 703; in all Lawrence, 822. . . .
>
> In the older sections of the city the light is very poor in many of the lower apartments, and the rooms are damp. The stairways in the older houses, particularly in the rear houses, are dark. The spaces between front and rear houses are poorly cared for and in many cases littered with rubbish. . . . Some of the rooms supposed to be used for bedrooms were too dark and damp for any use.

The report of the inspector of buildings of Lawrence for the year 1910 contains the following:

> Each year I have recommended that the city council take up the matter of revising the building ordinances. . . . This year I make the same suggestion. Under the present ordinance there is no provision for foundations, thickness of brick walls, size of floor timbers or columns, floor loads, lighting or ventilation of building, protection against fire, or any of the important matters which a building ordinance should restrict.

From the Commissioner of Labor's report we also learn that the density of population in the central congested district of Lawrence, if the 17 acres in the Common is excluded, is 119 per acre. There is one section of 14.9 acres where the density is 216 and another of 17.3 acres where the density is 214. The densities in the six half blocks, as previously stated, ranged between 243 and 556. Two half blocks on the east end of Common street adjoin each other on the south side of the street, and with one-half the surrounding streets contain 3.2 acres. All the houses but three are wooden. This is the greatest concentration of population in wooden houses in any three acres in the State of Massachusetts. No three acres in the State exceed it except at the infamous centers of Boston, where the houses are predominantly brick.

In Tables VIII, IX, X, and XI are presented certain vital statistics for twelve cities of Massachusetts, compiled partly from data found in Commissioner Neill's report and partly from data in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The infantile mortality rate for 1908, 1909, and 1910 for these cities is given in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII. — *Death Rate of Infants under One Year per 1,000 Births for 12 Massachusetts Cities in 1908, 1909, and 1910.*

CITIES.	1908	1909	1910
Boston,	149	120	126
Brockton,	97	119	99
Cambridge,	118	102	119
Fall River,	178	186	186
Holyoke,	182	231	213
Lawrence,	155	172	167
Lowell,	202	185	231
Lynn,	111	99	97
New Bedford,	144	143	177
Somerville,	98	84	101
Springfield,	96	114	124
Worcester,	114	121	137

Note the wide range between an infant mortality rate of 231 per thousand in Holyoke in 1909 and 213 in Lowell in 1910, and 84 per thousand in Somerville in 1909.

Table IX shows for the same twelve cities for the year 1910:

1. Total number of children under 5 years of age.
2. Number of deaths of children under 5 years of age.
3. Death rate under 5 years of age per 1,000 children under 5 years of age.

Note the appalling rates for Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, and New Bedford — truly appalling in comparison with the figures for Somerville and Brockton.

TABLE IX. — *Children under Five Years: Total Number, Number of Deaths, and Death Rate per 1,000 in 12 Massachusetts Cities, 1910.*

CITIES.	Total Number	Number of Deaths	Death Rate per 1,000
Boston,	63,725	3,122	49.0
Brockton,	5,342	182	34.1
Cambridge,	10,802	401	37.1
Fall River,	13,997	1,110	79.3
Holyoke,	6,002	470	78.3
Lawrence,	9,317	717	77.0
Lowell,	10,437	835	80.0
Lynn,	8,195	304	37.1
New Bedford,	10,700	894	83.6
Somerville,	7,433	240	32.3
Springfield,	8,292	458	55.2
Worcester,	14,492	732	50.5

Table X which follows shows for the same 12 cities the number and percentage of deaths of persons under 1 year of age and the number and percentage of deaths under 5 years of age.

TABLE X. — *Total Number of Deaths; Number of Deaths under One Year and under Five Years of Age; Ratio in Percentage of Such Deaths to Total Deaths in 12 Massachusetts Cities, 1910.*

CITIES.	Total Deaths	NUMBER OF DEATHS		PERCENTAGE OF DEATHS	
		Under One Year	Under Five Years	Under One Year	Under Five Years
Boston,	11,567[1]	2,252	3,122	19.5	27.0
Brockton,	710	138	182	19.4	25.6
Cambridge,	1,576	292	401	18.5	25.4
Fall River,	2,206	855	1,110	38.8	50.3
Holyoke,	1,027	363	470	35.3	45.8
Lawrence,	1,534	532	717	34.7	46.7
Lowell,	2,101	608	835	28.9	39.7
Lynn,	1,184	222	304	18.8	25.7
New Bedford,	1,821	694	894	38.1	49.1
Somerville,	1,043	175	240	16.8	23.0
Springfield,	1,484	307	458	20.7	30.9
Worcester,	2,481	537	732	21.6	29.5

[1] Includes deaths of non-residents and those of unknown residence.

Following are shown death rates per 100,000 population from certain ailments:

TABLE XI. — *Death Rate per 100,000 Population by Certain Causes in 12 Massachusetts Cities, 1910.*

CITIES.	Typhoid Fever	Measles	Scarlet Fever	Whooping Cough	Diphtheria and Croup	Tuberculosis of the Lungs	Tuberculosis Meningitis	Other Forms of Tuberculosis	Bronchitis	Pneumonia (All Forms)	Other Respiratory Diseases	Diarrhea and Enteritis (under 2 Years)	Congenital Debility and Malformation
Boston, ...	11.3	14.2	9.2	7.6	23.9	171.7	21.5	11.4	24.6	213.0	11.9	100.6	89.5
Brockton, ...	15.7	1.7	15.7	–	8.7	87.3	22.7	17.5	12.2	106.5	22.7	41.9	85.6
Cambridge, ...	9.5	3.8	2.9	3.8	22.8	245.4	14.3	9.5	27.6	182.6	15.2	94.2	84.6
Fall River, ...	15.0	17.5	2.5	15.9	19.2	141.8	5.8	8.3	78.4	196.0	16.7	373.8	135.2
Holyoke, ...	15.1	18.9	–	12.1	18.9	129.2	8.6	8.6	20.7	232.5	18.9	270.4	174.0
Lawrence, ...	16.2	20.8	8.1	18.5	39.3	108.6	23.1	12.7	38.1	235.7	18.5	305.0	105.1
Lowell, ...	19.7	28.1	41.2	5.6	20.6	112.4	19.7	12.2	84.3	196.7	18.7	252.0	146.1
Lynn, ...	16.7	4.5	5.6	8.9	21.1	112.4	11.1	14.5	14.5	155.8	13.4	81.2	61.2
New Bedford, ...	21.5	41.0	5.1	8.2	25.6	112.7	15.4	11.3	46.1	186.5	23.6	324.8	130.1
Somerville, ...	10.3	5.2	6.4	1.3	27.1	98.0	14.2	5.2	19.3	158.6	11.6	67.0	55.4
Springfield, ...	14.5	14.5	22.3	23.4	41.3	81.5	3.3	16.7	21.2	184.2	12.3	109.4	98.2
Worcester, ...	15.7	15.7	3.4	21.8	34.8	103.6	17.0	10.9	27.3	190.1	10.9	134.3	95.4

If there were no escape from the conditions indicated on the preceding pages our situation would be deplorable indeed. If lack of room compelled the inhabitants of Massachusetts to huddle together in unhealthful, demoralizing congestion, we might despair of any progress other than the elevation of a few above the sad condition of the great mass of humanity. We might steel our hearts against sympathy with the pitiful lot of the poor and lay the blame upon some power higher than ourselves. If the entire area of all these cities and the towns surrounding them were in full, intensive use, we might give up in despair the problem of congested population. But the land is not in use. Not half the opportunities within cities for healthful habitations are improved. Even in the most crowded of our cities there is room to spare. While hundreds of thousands are losing health and hope in crowded tenements, tens of thousands of acres within the limits of the cities themselves are untouched, and just outside their borders are limitless opportunities for expansion.

Consider the number of inhabitants, the area and the density of population in the various cities of the Commonwealth, as shown in Table XII:

TABLE XII. — *Area, Population, and Density of Massachusetts Cities, 1910.*

CITIES.	Area (Number of Acres)	Population	Number of Persons per Acre
Beverly,	9,832.0	18,650	2.0
Boston,	26,026.0	670,585	25.7
Brockton,	13,744.7	56,878	4.1
Cambridge,	4,570.2	104,839	22.9
Chelsea,	1,391.8	32,452	23.3
Chicopee,	16,448.0	25,401	1.5
Everett,	2,396.7	33,484	14.0
Fall River,	24,371.9	119,295	4.9
Fitchburg,	18,134.0	37,826	2.1
Gloucester,	16,929.3	24,398	1.4
Haverhill,	22,934.0	44,115	1.9
Holyoke,	10,752.0	57,730	5.4
Lawrence,	4,636.4	85,892	18.5
Lowell,	9,131.3	106,294	11.6

TABLE XII. — *Area, Population, and Density of Massachusetts Cities, 1910* — Concluded.

CITIES.	Area (Number of Acres)	Population	Number of Persons per Acre
Lynn,	7,177.2	89,336	12.4
Malden,	3,285.1	44,404	13.5
Marlborough,	14,104.7	14,579	1.0
Medford,	5,619.5	23,150	4.1
Melrose,	3,070.2	15,715	5.1
New Bedford,	12,669.4	96,652	7.6
Newburyport,	5,700.6	14,949	2.6
Newton,	11,733.0	39,806	3.4
North Adams,	12,096.0	22,019	1.8
Northampton,	25,920.0	19,431	0.7
Pittsfield,	26,944.0	32,121	1.2
Quincy,	10,648.3	32,642	3.1
Salem,	5,233.5	43,697	8.3
Somerville,	2,634.3	77,236	29.3
Springfield,	20,296.0	88,926	4.4
Taunton,	31,099.2	34,259	1.1
Waltham,	8,650.1	27,834	3.2
Woburn,	8,388.4	15,308	1.8
Worcester,	24,642.8	145,986	5.9

In Boston, with its density of 25.7 persons per acre, nearly half the land is unoccupied. The total area is given as 26,026 acres. The annual report of the Assessing Department of the city of Boston for 1910 classifies 332,143,896 feet of land (7,625 acres) as occupied; 320,956,933 feet (7,368.2 acres) as vacant; 88,043,421 feet (2,021.2 acres) as marsh and flats. The above classification includes only taxable property, except land owned by the city where no building is attached. It excludes public and untaxed property. Instructions to assessors read:

> For vacant land take rear or even front land if there is a very disproportionate amount attached to a house and the number of square feet is quite large; also a lot of land upon which a little shop or other temporary building belonging to other than the owner of the soil may be placed. . . . Do not take as vacant land the large tracts held by railroads, charitable institutions, public institutions, or by corporations or firms that require large tracts for the prosecu-

> tion of their business, unless such lands are disconnected with their works. . . . In Wards 1, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, if the feet of land exceed 20,000, add to the value of the building 10,000 feet and call the balance vacant land.

Those 7,368.2 acres of vacant land within Boston's boundaries would accommodate about 300,000 persons (about five times the number now herded in unfit tenements) in single family houses with considerable space about them. The proportion of vacant territory is much larger in most of the cities of the State. Why is all this land idle when people suffer because of the lack of it?

A PROBLEM THAT MUST BE SOLVED.

The problem is one of proper distribution of population. The principal obstacles to its solution are low wages, the high cost of land, difficulty of obtaining funds, inadequate transportation. Yet it is imperative that this problem be solved, not only on account of obligations to humanity, but because the stability of the State is involved.

The physical condition of the home is so vitally related to morals, health, and the general well-being of the family and the individual that the welfare of the State depends upon it.

For the safety and progress of the Commonwealth every family should be housed in a wholesome home. The countless indecent, disease-breeding habitations menace the stability of the government. The existence of spots where 94 out of each thousand children under five years of age die annually is a reproach to the intelligence and conscience of the community. For the "protection and preservation" of its citizens — and of itself — the State should see to it that these places are purified.

The question of unhealthful congestion and its prevention is not new. The problem has been recognized as serious ever since the disproportionate ratio of growth between city and country was noted. In 1580 London prohibited the erection of new houses and ordered that only one family should live in each house. Charles I ordered persons from the country to return to their homes and Charles II issued royal edicts against concentration of population in cities.

But within the past 30 years the necessity for a solution has become more acute than formerly. The public conscience is growing more awake and sensitive to the evil. Governments have discovered that their means of defence are being weakened through deterioration of the physique of the men who should do the fighting in the case of war. Moreover, the drain from the country to the city is a factor in the high cost of living. The proportion of those producing directly from the soil is not as great as it should be.

All the cities abroad that have made permanent progress in making their communities more healthful and more desirable places in which to live have found planning in advance a necessity. Sometimes such planning covers the entire area of the city, sometimes only the parts intended for early development. The plans are carefully drawn by experts after long and exhaustive studies. They are then submitted to the city authorities, public hearings are held, and long consideration ensues. If public funds are to be used the plans go to the general government for approval. They are finally adopted only after all who are interested have had ample opportunity for criticism or protest.

Of course to plan the development of a city or town is the only sensible method of procedure. That is the method followed in all other activities. No matter how small the importance of any proposed work it is done according to a preconceived plan. A house, or a fence, or a ditch, all command some forethought and a plan of operation. But cities, the homes of millions, grow by chance, without conscious design, direction, or supervision. A street runs here, of such a width, to such a distance, because it was profitable or convenient to some person to have it so. The general health, or welfare, or convenience were not the consideration. Public buildings, parks, and open spaces are scattered here and there with but little forethought, and often as selfish influences dictate. An incalculable waste of effort, efficiency, health, and wealth ensues. Narrow, crooked streets, many of them dark, crowded, and impossible to keep in sanitary condition, are lined with buildings in which health, mentality, and morality decline. Men and women die before their time, thousands of children perish, and the lives of thousands more are blighted, — all because of the lack of study of the resources and possibilities of the locality and some foresight in planning for its needs.

With intelligent planning of the growth and development of our cities and towns the worker would be able at the smallest expense of time and money to earn his wage, to raise his family, to enjoy the necessities and privileges of pure light, water, and air, and to secure education and recreation, intellectual and physical. The factory, shop, or store would receive supplies and deliver output with economy of transportation and time. The central civic features, such as public buildings, parks, waterfront development, and institutions for education and recreation, would be within easy reach of all portions of the community. Public transportation lines would be designed to serve the entire community adequately without discomfort or congestion.

This Commission presses upon the attention of the Legislature the urgent need of intelligent planning of the growth of cities and towns, not so much to avoid economic waste and to facilitate and expedite the transaction of business as, to quote the language of the Constitution, for the "protection and preservation of its subjects" of the Commonwealth and to save the lives of numberless children.

Can the supply of healthful habitations be sufficiently increased through private enterprise and capital? Not by past methods. They have all failed. Forty years of regulation and inspection have left us in about the same condition we were. Model tenements have produced no appreciable effect. There remains only the suburban development known as the "garden" movement. Abroad it involves intelligent planning wholesale purchase and construction, sales at cost on long time payment, or moderate rentals., Often it includes intensive culture of the soil. Many such enterprises have been very successful not only in attaining the social objects sought, but also as financial propositions. Such ventures should be carefully supervised and regulated by law.

Corporations should be created to provide healthful homes at cost by the acquisition of tracts of land, their improvement and development, and the construction thereon of suitable dwellings. Funds could be raised by the sale of common and preferred stock, dividends to be limited. Subscriptions to the common stock should be invited only from persons desiring to acquire a home through the company. Each such corporation might well obtain a large tract of land outside the minimum carfare limit, about a third to be reserved for the use of the company and the remainder to be divided into plots of about an acre each. Other smaller tracts could be acquired within the minimum carfare limit and divided, say, into plots varying from 2,000 to 5,000 feet in size. All plots should be for sale or to rent to common stockholders at cost, with or without buildings, but with stringent requirements as to full use and upkeep.

There should be an agricultural expert to direct the intensive cultivation of the land held in common, instruct the dwellers on plots, supervise their operations, and market surplus products when such service is desired. The teams and heavy tools necessary for the common plot could be used for the heavy work on the smaller plots so that individuals would need to purchase only the lighter, inexpensive tools.

Competent instruction and facilities for marketing the surplus products are essentials of such an enterprise. In many instances the cost of the dwelling could be met by the product of the smaller tracts, and in some cases on the acre tracts, there could be produced as much or more in value as is now received in wages by the average mechanic or laborer. This phase of the subject has never been given the consideration it deserves. However, Mr. Edward Ewing Pratt in the December, 1912, issue of "The American City" gives some particulars regarding such work in Bournville, England:

> One of the most interesting developments in Bournville, as well as in Port Sunlight and the other garden cities, is the gardens and allotments. Their cultivation has been very successful. Tests were made at Bournville to ascertain the real value of these gardens. The result of a test of 25 gardens showed an average net yield of 2s. per week for each garden throughout the year. The total net yield for the 25 gardens was £128 16s. 0½d., or a rate of £58 18s. 5d. per acre.
>
> A writer in the "Economic Review," using slightly different figures, pointed out:
>
> There are 43½ acres under cultivation, and at the ascertained average yield per acre of £59 8s. 8d. per annum, this gives a total of £2,585 7s. per annum. Under ordinary methods of farming, the yield was previously less than £5 per acre per annum; that is, the total yield of 77 acres which are at present opened out used to be £385 per annum. Thus, at the present these 77 acres produce

> more than six times the value of their former produce, and in addition at the same time house under ideal conditions a population of nearly two thousand.

Such ventures, if sufficiently numerous, would bring thousands out of congested unhealthful centers. They would open up countless new opportunities of employment and greatly increase the supply of food products. They would not only be of large benefit to the persons directly affected, both in health and finances, but would improve the general health and well-being of the entire community.

European governments have invested many millions in the effort to obliterate the slums and ensure their people wholesome habitations. Some of the money has been expended directly in buying land and building. More has been loaned to municipalities and associations engaged in such work. The vast sums accumulated by the industrial insurance system of Germany are available at low rates for this purpose. The British Government loans directly from the public funds and, in some cases, subsidizes efforts to improve housing conditions. Special pains are taken to encourage private initiative and enterprise. A review of such undertakings all over the world was given in Labor Bulletin 88, issued by the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics.

The attempt to abolish unhealthful congested living conditions began with legal regulation. Minute requirements as to light, air, sanitary facilities and conditions were prescribed. Then buildings were ordered reconstructed, vacated, or demolished. Model tenements were built, and finally efforts were made to bring the people back toward the country through suburban development. This led to garden suburbs, garden villages, and garden cities. These give promise of a solution of the problem. Of Germany, it is said that there is scarcely a city of importance that has not a garden city plan afoot. However, the slums and slum-dwellers of Europe have only been reduced in number, not eliminated.

New Zealand and the States of the Australian Commonwealth have done better. The governments there buy land freely, make it more easily available to those who would live upon it, aid them to start, and allow long time for repayment. Congested areas are nearly unknown there.

In this country the fight for better homes began in New York in 1856 and has progressed but slowly. The congested areas of that city are now more extensive than then. In Boston, after 40 years of intermittent agitation, legal regulation and inspection, and several attempts to solve the problem by the erection of model tenements and dwelling houses, conditions are yet as set forth in the preceding pages. Philadelphia, with its endless number of one-family houses, seems to be better situated than other large American cities — but slum evils are great there also. Washington, notwithstanding an extensive development of three-room sanitary tenements at rents from $7 to $11 per month, presents the following comparison between death rates in its alley slums and on its more healthful streets:[1]

Death Rate per 1,000.

AGES.	Alleys	Streets
All ages,	30.09	17.56
Under 1 year,	373.49	158.66
1 to 4 years,	30.82	16.75
5 to 20 years,	7.84	5.25
Over 20 years,	27.05	18.08

Some health conditions are shown as follows:

CAUSES OF DEATH.	WHITE		COLORED	
	Alleys	Streets	Alleys	Streets
Pneumonia,	310.9	117.9	432.8	188.1
Tuberculosis,	186.5	121.2	621.3	433.7
Whooping cough,	62.2	5.3	21.9	15.6
Diarrhea (under 2 years),	62.2	36.8	321.6	137.8

CONCLUSIONS.

This Commission was created in response to an earnest desire to bring healthful suburban homes within the reach of the poor. Its recommendation that the uncalled for savings banks deposits be used for that purpose having been rejected by the Supreme

---

[1] The Survey, October 19, 1912.

Court as unconstitutional, and the Legislature having authorized the continuation of its investigations, the foregoing is set forth as a brief summary of the information it has gathered as to the need of a larger supply of wholesome homes.

The Commission's conclusions are:

1. That present conditions are not only unjust to the laboring classes but seem to be detrimental to the general health and may be a contributory cause of unnecessary deaths, breeding disease, poverty, ignorance, vice, and crime, and blighting the lives of thousands who might otherwise have been good and useful citizens.

2. That these conditions are to some extent the result of the haphazard, unsystematic development of our cities, and the selfish utilization of their natural resources, and the resultant conditions of lack of room, air and sunlight in congested tenement districts undoubtedly tend to increase infantile mortality.

3. That each city and large town should make at once a thorough study of its resources and possibilities, what ills in housing and development now exist, and how they can be remedied and their growth prevented.

These conclusions impel the Commission to recommend:

1. *That planning boards be instituted in each city and town of more than 10,000 inhabitants.* The work of such boards would show what the actual local conditions are and would disclose the resources at hand to better them. The spread of bad conditions would be stopped and means found gradually to abolish slums now existing.

2. *That the Commonwealth and community encourage and promote the formation of associations to plan and construct low-cost suburban homes.*

Bills in support of these recommendations are presented herewith.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL PLANNING BOARDS.

SECTION 1. Each city of the commonwealth and each town having a population of more than ten thousand at the last preceding national or state census shall and is hereby authorized to create a board to be known as a planning board, whose duty it shall be to make careful studies of the resources, possibilities, and needs of the city or town, particularly with respect to conditions which may be injurious to the public health in connection with rented dwellings, and to make plans for the development of the municipality with special reference to the proper housing of its people. In cities, said board shall be appointed by the mayor, subject to confirmation by the council, and in cities under a commission form of government, so-called, the members of said board shall be designated by the governing body of the city. In towns, the members of said board shall be selected by the citizens at the annual town meeting.

SECTION 2. Each local planning board as provided for by this act shall report annually to the city council in cities and to the annual town meeting in towns and shall file with the Massachusetts homestead commission a copy of each of its reports.

SECTION 3. The city council or other governing body in cities is authorized to make suitable ordinances, and towns are authorized to make by-laws, such as may be deemed necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act, and they may appropriate money for said purposes.

SECTION 4. The homestead commission, created by chapter six hundred and seven of the acts of the year nineteen hundred and eleven, is hereby directed to call the attention of the mayor and city governments in cities and the selectmen in each town having a population of more than ten thousand at the last preceding national or state census to the provisions of this act in such form as may seem proper; and said commission is furthermore authorized and directed to furnish information and suggestions from time to time to city governments and to the selectmen of towns and to local planning boards, when the same shall have been created, such as may, in its judgment, tend to promote the purposes of this act and of those for which the said commission has been established.

SECTION 5. This act shall take effect upon its passage.

AN ACT TO FURTHER ENLARGE AND DEFINE THE DUTIES OF THE HOMESTEAD COMMISSION.

SECTION 1. The homestead commission, created by chapter six hundred and seven of the acts of the year nineteen hundred and eleven, is authorized to continue its investigations of housing conditions and their effects, and the efforts being made in Massachusetts and elsewhere to increase the supply of wholesome suburban homes; to make studies of the operation of building and tenement house laws; to gather information relating to city and town planning, and to cooperate with local agencies in Massachusetts engaged in such work for the use of such boards; and to encourage the formation of organizations intended to increase the supply of wholesome homes for the people.

SECTION 2. The commission shall be enlarged by the addition of two members, one of whom shall be an attorney-at-law and one a recognized expert in the planning of cities and towns; and the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the council, shall, as soon as possible after the passage of this act, appoint the said additional members, one of whom shall serve for a term of two years and one for a term of one year, and upon the expiration of said terms, said additional members shall be appointed in the manner provided for herein for periods of three years each.

SECTION 3. The commission shall continue to report annually to the general court, and may expend in carrying out the purposes of this act a sum not to exceed three thousand dollars.

SECTION 4. This act shall take effect upon its passage.